Appl. No. 10/692,525
Amdt. dated March 20, 2009
Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2008

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1, 3-18, 20-23 and 25-42 pending. In this amendment, claims 1, 18, and 23 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added. No new matter is added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-18, 20-23, and 25-42 are pending.

I. Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. This rejection is traversed. The claims have been amended to recite limitations that have sufficient antecedent basis in the specification. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101, Non-Statutory Subject Matter

Claims 18, 20-23, 25-39, and 41-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action mailed December 22, 2008 ("Office Action") alleges that insufficient support exists in the specification for an apparatus comprising "*one or more processors coupled to a memory*" and that insufficient structure is disclosed to support means plus function claim language. This rejection is traversed.

The claims have been amended to remove the references to a processor and memory. The claims have further been amended to recite that the apparatus is a computer. Structure supporting the means plus function claim language is thus provided in the specification in the form of a computer. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, including such places as paragraph 11.

Appl. No. 10/692,525
Amdt. dated March 20, 2009
Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2008

PATENT

III.   Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a) Davis, Webber

Claims 1, 3-18, 20-23, and 25-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Davis* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0041077 A1), in view of *Webber* (U.S. Patent No.

6,418,400 B1). This rejection is traversed.

For example, each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, is not disclosed or

suggested, by *Davis* and *Webber*, alone or in combination. For example, claim 1 as amended

recites in part, "*wherein a user modifies the internal metadata to indicate the internal metadata*

is to be mapped to external metadata." Such a limitation is not disclosed or suggested in *Davis*.

Davis may describe a system where a user specifies a mapfile. (*Davis* P[0114]). The mapfile

specifies locations, such as a database, of data items to be retrieved for a report. (*Davis* P[0121]).

This data and the mapfile may then be used in conjunction with a report template to produce an

output report. ((*Davis* P[0122]). However, *Davis* does not disclose or suggest modifying the

original data as stored in the database.

The combination of *Davis* with *Webber*, even if there were motivation to do so, still does

not disclose or suggest such a limitation. *Webber* describes a system for electronic data

interchange. (*Webber* Abstract). Data may be retrieved from various sources. (*Webber* Column

4, lines 11-14). Using a spreadsheet like template, a mapping between data from the data

sources and an output may be created. (*Webber* Column 4, lines 15-25). The template may be

used to retrieve data from the data sources, transform the data into a different format, and send

the data to another entity. (*Webber* Column 9, lines 37-46). *Webber* does not disclose or suggest

modifying the original data as stored in the data source. As such, neither *Davis* nor *Webber*

disclose or suggest modifying data in the underlying data source, and cannot, alone or in

combination, teach or suggest "*wherein a user may modify the internal metadata to indicate the*

internal metadata is to be mapped to external metadata." Support for this amendment to claim 1

can be found in the specification, including places such as paragraph 20.

As another example, claim 1, as amended recites in part: "*storing said report definition,*

the report definition containing the mapping of internal metadata to external metadata for the

report." As explained above, both *Davis* and *Webber* describe a mapfile / template that is used

to map the underlying data source to an output report or output to another entity. The cited references do not disclose or suggest the mapping of the internal data to the external data is contained within the report itself, as both references teach an external mapfile or template is used to perform the mapping. As such, *Davis* and *Webber*, alone or in combination, cannot disclose or suggest "*storing said report definition, the report definition containing the mapping of internal metadata to external metadata for the report.*" Support for this amendment to claim 1 can be found in the specification, including places such as paragraph 18.

As explained above, each and every limitation of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by *Davis* and *Webber*, alone or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and the claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested. Independent claims 18 and 23 contain limitations that are also not disclosed by *Davis* and *Webber*, alone or in combination, for reasons including at least those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejections of claim 18 and 23, and the claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

IV.   Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified or addressed in the remarks section, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

Appl. No. 10/692,525
Amdt. dated March 20, 2009
Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Preetam B. Pagar/

Preetam B. Pagar
Reg. No. 57,684

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
PBP:scz
61850880 v1